

A
VINDICATION

OF THE
Presbyterians in Scotland,

FROM THE
Malicious *Aspersions* cast upon them

In a late PAMPHLET,

Written by Sir George Mackenzie late Lord Advocate
there, Intituled, *A Vindication of the Government in
Scotland during the Reign of King Charles II. &c.*

By a Lover of Truth.

*O lingua fraudis machinatrix impia,
Qua spe meum oppugnas caput?
Scythæ ferocis lingua Pestilentior
Tinctis veneno spiculis.
Ignis voracis lingua flammis acrior,
Quam silva flagrat arida.
Buchanan. Plal. CXX. 3, 4*

LONDON,
Printed for Edward Golding, 1692.

VINDICATION

OF THE

PROSECUTION IN SCOTLAND

OF

THE HONOURABLE LORDS OF THE COURT OF SESSION

IN THE CASE OF

THE HONOURABLE LORDS OF THE COURT OF SESSION

IN THE CASE OF

AND

THE HONOURABLE LORDS OF THE COURT OF SESSION

IN THE CASE OF

THE HONOURABLE LORDS OF THE COURT OF SESSION

IN THE CASE OF

THE HONOURABLE LORDS OF THE COURT OF SESSION

IN THE CASE OF

THE HONOURABLE LORDS OF THE COURT OF SESSION

IN THE CASE OF

LONDON

Printed and Sold by J. G. & Co. 1788

THIS very unaccountable, that whilst not a few Virulent and Lying Pamphlets against the Present Establishment in *Scotland* have come abroad, they should be generally entertained with so profound a Silence, as is usually the Concomitant of the greatest Guilt. And since it can be plainly demonstrated, that it does not proceed from this, it must be acknowledged, that 'tis owing to a Prodigious Stupidity and Supineness in those Persons to suffer themselves to be thus *impune* traduced: 'Tis too apparent, what Advantages their Restless and Tyrannical Enemies reap thereby, who like that Arch-Tyrant their Master *Lucifer*, are incessantly pushing on their Mischievous Designs, the Effects of which we have in part tasted already, and may yet more, if a seasonable Diligence in exposing them to the World do not prevent it. Let not therefore a Selfish, Timorous, nor Slavish Principle, or a Prodigious Supineness, deter any from so commendable a design as is the defending our Liberties and Privileges against those Men, who have been so *Mighty Hunters* after them, and at last the Overthrowers thereof, and setting them forth in their own Colours, that the Government nor Subjects, may be no more imposed upon by so Spurious a Race of Mankind, whom, should we judge of them by their Actions, we would rather conclude to be of Diabolical than Humane Extract.

But lest, I should seem to lay heavy burthens on other Mens Shoulders, and refuse to touch them with one of my Fingers, I shall briefly here, tho' in a total Diffidence of my Ability to engage so Learned an Adversary, as Sir *George Mackenzie* was, make some Remarks on his Vindication; and leaving the Law Part to Gentlemen of the Long Robe, I shall content my Self with shewing the World with what Ingenuity he represents those Persons, who were the Butt of the Fury of that Government he undertakes the Vindication of: And if I can Evince to the World, that they whom he represents as the *Refuse of Mankind*, were but acted by the same Principles that the Generality of Men are; and that what they are charged with is but what the most pretendedly Loyal have, or would have under the same Circumstances been guilty of, then I hope I shall appear to have

rendred

rendred useless our Gentlemans best Engine for vindicating that Government.

And, in the first place, it may seem strange that any Person should undertake the Vindication of the Management of Affairs in Scotland, under the Reign of *Charles II.* Since no Body, that we know of, has in Print undertaken that of the Management of Affairs then even here, where things were not screwed up to the height they were in that Kingdom: But above all it may be matter of highest admiration, that a Person who was as much Dipt, as any in those Arbitrary Proceedings, should aspire to impose thus far on the World, and more, that any should be so credulous, as to receive as Truths, what the Passion our Author discovers throughout the whole Pamphlet, plainly declares how unlikely he was to give a true Relation of. But to be brief;

He would have done well to have mentioned the Particulars wherewith those Malicious Authors he mentions reproached the Government; and then refuted them by plain Matter of Fact: This would have procured greater Credit from all Judicious, Unbiass'd Persons, than a bare representing them as it pleased him, and that Faction.

This Author was too forward, when he asserted that those that complained of Oppressions in Kings *Charles II.* Reign, were the first Aggressors in the Reign of King *Charles I.* Since 'tis too obvious, that what they Acted then was mostly defensive: It is sufficiently known what Infringments upon their Liberties that King made. It would be thought no small Encroachment here to introduce a New Mode of Worship without its being enacted by Parliament. How Passive-spirited soever we are 'tis hardly to be believed we would suffer it. And 'tis beyond all denial true, that King *Charles I.* attempted it there, and that that alone did raise the Ferment of the Nation against him, and brought upon him all the Miseries he suffered from thence.

He concludes this Paragraph with saying, that what was done against them, rather deserves rather the Name of Self-defence than Persecution. But let's hear how he makes good this Assertion.

For clearing this, he says, 'tis necessary to represent that in the Year 1637. We lived under the most Pious and Orthodox Prince of the Ages, and yet a Rebellion was form'd against him, as a Papiſt, and a Tyrant, &c. But how Pious and Ortho-

Orthodox soever this Prince was (as 'tis none of my business to Question either) yet when so great Infringements were made upon the Priviledges of the People, so Arbitrary Imprisonings, Finings, &c. (which are too Notorious for Impudence it self to deny) 'twas no contemptible Sign, that the best that could be said of him was that he was too much Influenced by Bad Counsel, which is at least a Corruption : And 'tis a no less true than usual saying, *Corruptio optimi pessima*, and if they took what course they thought conduced most for their Security, 'tis but what may be Parallell'd in several Ages past : And late times have informed us, that not a few of those Persons, who have condemned this Practice of theirs, against the Lords Anointed, have been forced in Extremity to have-recourse to a much like Expedient : And therefore, I think, what he insinuates upon this Head will have little Influence on any, save our present Malecontents.

He proceeds to aggravate their Crimes, wherein he must needs be Guilty of the Higheft Disingenuity, or *Ibid.* Gross Ignorance of Matters of Fact (the latter of which is hardly credible of a Man of his Industry and Learning) while he says that Covenants were entred into by a Part of the Subjects, since it is certain that the Covenant was made by the Body of the Parliament, the Earl of *Montrose* himself (who was afterwards so great a Champion for them) concurring at first as vigorously as any ; and 'tis sufficiently known, that it was upon a disgust, probably owing to his aspiring Genius, (who like another *Pompey non modo Superior, sed nec Parem ferre valebat*) that he became such a Champion for the Arbitrary Cause. And supposing they had any just ground for defending themselves, Liberties, &c. (As if when a King takes upon him to alter the Settlement stablish'd by Law be not, I know not when it will be, and afterwards it may be too late) then their entring into Leagues for that Effect against a Prince and those Wicked Ministers under him, will not be so great a Bugbear as this Gentleman would make it to appear. Since the Protestants in *Germany*, the *Netherlands*, &c. did the like ; besides, notwithstanding what our Authors says, p. 3. That we had neither formerly known Oaths nor Burthens under our Gentle Kings, 'tis sufficiently known that *R. Charles I.* (when the Earl of *Traquair* sat at the Helm there) imposed on the Subjects an Oath commonly called the *Tender* with great Severity generally over the Countrey, and 'tis not

improbable, that the Covenant was a Counter-Oath to that. But that such Violence was used in imposing the Covenant as this Gentleman says (tho' I will not deny, but that it was imposed more than perhaps was fitting) is an Assertion, which he and his Party cannot demonstrate.

That the General Assembly refused to rise, when Dissolved by the Kings Commissioner, was because they were authorized so to do by the Parliament. That they threw out the Bishops without the Authority of Parliament is false, since they had their allowance for it. And tho' this Gentleman is pleased to say, that the Bishops were always the first of the three Estates of Parliament, yet 'tis not to be received as an undoubted Truth, for setting aside that it has been urged by as strong, if not stronger Arguments, than the contrary has either by him, or a Learned Prelate, that at the first Propagation of the Christian Religion in *Scotland*, they had no Diocesan Bishops, but the Church was governed by *Culdees* or *Monks*; yet this is certain, that for several Parliaments next after the Reformation, and during King *James's* Residence there were no Bishops, and consequently none sat there; and that in *Nov. 1610*. three of the nominated *Scotch* Bishops came up to *London* to receive Consecration, that they might go down and confer the Holy Ghost upon their Brethren. And it may be collected from Histories by what Indirect means Bishops were established there, *viz.* by imprisoning and sending for to *London* the Leading Men in the Assembly, bribing others that were at home, and threatening others, if they stood up for the Discipline of the Church: And the Bishops themselves solemnly protested in the presence of the Assembly, that they would never exercise that Authority, as it was in *England*, when all the while this was a meer trick to blind the Eyes of the Assembly till such time as they were fully settled in the Saddle. Besides, most of our first Bishops were Men very unfit for so weighty a Charge as that is, as will appear by the following Verses made upon their Vices, which because they may have come to the hands of few here, for the Readers Satisfaction, I shall here insert.

*Vina amat Andreas, cum vino Glasgva amores,
Ros catui, Ludas Galva, Brichæus opes :
Aulam Orcas, Ollam Moravus, parit Insula fraudes,
Dumblanus tricas, nomen Abredonius ;*

Fata .

*Fata Caledonius fraterni ruminat agri
 Rarus adis parochos O Catanæ tuos.
 Solus in Argadiis Præsul meritisſimus Oris,
 Vera Miniſterii Symbola Solus habet.*

I might ſay much more of theſe Gentlemen but will not trouble the Reader with it.

'Tis an Untruth *that any were put to Death merely for defending their own Houſes*. We do not hear any of P. 3. Note put to death ſave the Earl of *Montroſe*. And how *Mercileſs* that Nobleman was at *Kilſyth* and other Places, is too well known, ſo that he rendred himſelf generally Odious. What he ſays of borrowing vaſt Sums of Money ſignifies little to the Purpoſe, ſince 'tis ſufficiently known that a War could not be carried on without Money: But it is certain the *Ib*. Gentlemen of his ſide ſtood not upon the Ceremonies of borrowing, for they left neither Money nor Goods where they came, and never queſtioned their Right to any thing could they but lay their fingers on't.

If this Gentleman had had the leaſt Grain of Ingenuity, he would have acknowledged that the *Presbyterians Ibid*. were moſt Inſtrumental in bringing home King *Charles* the II. and 'tis to be proved in Spite of him and his Party, that the *Presbyterians in Scotland* did behave themſelves moſt Loyally during the time of the Uſurpation; and that, if we except two or three, all that were advanced to be Biſhops at that Kings Reſtauration had been the greateſt Compliers with and Cajolers of the Uſurpation. Any that liv'd in thoſe days. can inform us of their behaviour, as *Dr. Sharp* made A. B. of *St. Andrews*, Hinniman of *Patterſon* of *Roſi*, not to mention others. But our Author ſays truly that *the worſt of the People grew weary of them*. For it is certain they laid ſuch re- *Ibid*. ſtraints on thoſe Men, ſo as they could not go on in their full career in ſin, that conſcientious Miniſters were entertained by them with the ſame Language that our Saviour was by the Unclean Spirits; *Art thou come to torment us before our time?* And the bleſſed Effect of this was clearly ſeen, for whereas before when that Church was Maimed by having the Principal Order of her Guides lopt off, 'twas lookt upon as odious if perſons neglected

Praying in their Families, in a short time after this Primitive Discipline was restor'd, (would have been no hard matter to have found a whole Parish of the Publick Communion where God was not formally worshipt in Families, tho' his Name it may be prophaned an hundred times a day. And any Person that seem'd sober, and would not run with them to the same excess of Riot, was branded with the Name of Fanatick, Hypocrite, and what not; and all Religion notoriously sciss'd at. This in modest Terms might have been asserted of 16. in 20. of that Communion. Which brings into my mind how Prophetical the Judicious *Beza* was of the *Scottish* Prelates *Kidney* in a Letter of his to Mr. *Knox*, part whereof I shall here set down. " But, (*said he speaking of* " them,) I would have you, my dear *Knox* and the other Brethren, to remember that which is before your Eyes: As Bishops " brought forth the Papacy; so false Bishops the Relicks of Popery, will bring in Epicurism into the World: They that desire " the Churches good and safety, let them take heed of this Pestilence; and seeing that you have put that Plague to flight "tiously, I heartily pray you that you never admit it again; albeit " it seem plausible with the pretence or colour of keeping Unity, " which pretence deceived the Ancient Fathers, yea many even the " best of them.

This Gentleman notoriously prevaricates in this Paragraph when he says. " That the Parliament found " that all the Disorders proceeded from the solemn League " and Covenant, and those that adher'd thereto; and that they " therefore endeavoured to persuade the Presbyterians to " disown it: but finding them Stubborn, to prevent acting the " same things over again, they restored Episcopacy. But I would know what these Disorders were: Why resisting the Lords Anointed, and not suffering him to tyrannize at pleasure. It is sufficiently known that both the Parliament in *Scotland* and that here in *England* immediately after the Restauration, to shew their Derestation of the former Parliaments Proceedings and their Zeal for unbounded Monarchy, took very unaccountable Measures, and inconsiderately betrayed the Priviledges of the People, and did what lay in them to Tempt Kings to become Tyrants: and so as they repeal'd the Covenant, they made a Declaration which at last

was as generally Imposed as it was, whereby they obliged Men to declare upon Oath, That it was Unlawful upon any pretence whatsoever to take up Arms against the King or any Commissioned by him. And to this Oath and the Preaching the Joyful Tidings of of Passive Obedience, we owe all the Miseries we have suffered since. It is certain that this Oath was made Principally as a Trap for the Dissenters, as being the only Persons charged with the Guilt of the War against King Charles I. (tho' it is sufficiently known that in England at least the greatest part of the Church of England (except we will restrict it to those few hundreds now that have not bowed the Knee to that Baal of the People, to use the Jacobites canting expression, with some other of the Honest Vicar of Brays Principles their Well-wishers) joyned with the Parliament, it it be but considered that the Number of Dissenters now is not the Third of the Inhabitants of England, when it is far greater than it was at the beginning of the Civil War.) But behold the Justice of God ! For he made this Oath which they designed as a Whip to chastise others a Rod for their own Backs, and suffered them to run on so far in their inconsideration, that in the End they found themselves obliged to Justifie by their Practice, what before they had by a Law condemned in those Honest Patriots, both here and in Scotland, that stood up for the Liberties of the People. And this was not only the practice of Laymen, but even some in the Highest of the Spiritual sphere, did so far Justifie the Proceedings of both those Parliaments as to take Arms against the Lords Anointed, with a *Nolumus Leges Angliæ Mutari*. Nor were there any that we know of that at that time disapproved, or at least declared against Subjects joyning with his present Majesty against King James ; and the Scripture says, *He that is not against us is for us* : Nay, did not even our Tender-conscienc'd scrupling Bishops, refuse to sign an Abhorrence of his present Majesties Undertaking, and to declare that it was Unlawful upon pain of Damnation (as was formerly sound- ed from our Wooden Pulpits I had almost said by Wooden Priests) for any of the Subjects to joyn with him against the late King James, the then Lords Anointed ? All which plainly indicates to us how miserably the People had been bubbled out of their Priviledge, by Gentlemen whom of all other it might have been least expected from : So that had it not pleased God in his Good-
ness

ness to make their Copy hold to be touched, we had been (for ought can be seen to the contrary) precipitated into Irremediable slavery. I shall not here Trouble the Reader with a Parallel of the two Kings Illegal Proceedings, it having been so effectually done already that Reason is fully satisfied in the point, It is sufficient to remark that we were willing, to part with that Doctrine we so much valued our selves upon, when a regulating our Practice by it seem'd to threaten us with a storm. A plain Indication that it was but a Bait to fish Benefices, and a Trap to catch simple People in.

What he says *That that Parliament restored Episcopacy so much the more because that Government had in no Age nor Place forced its way into the state by the Sword,* is much of a Piece with the Rest, and there's scarce any will believe that that was the Parliaments Motive. All that can be said with respect to the Bishops not forcing their way into the state, is only because they never had so strong a Party in that Kingdom, and that all the Kings that set them up there, were grasping after an Arbitrary Government, for all the reason King James the I. there the VI. gave, for the Expediency of Bishops there, was, that he had not sufficient strength on his side to ballance the Parliament. &c. therefore that it was requisite there should be Bishops to vote for him in Parliament. But whatever this Gentleman subtly suggests, the World is not so simple now as to believe that they would not use their Utmost Efforts either to introduce or support themselves. It is sufficiently known what they have done to preserve themselves in that Countrey, and how much they forwarded Arbitrary Government there (it plainly appearing that the pretended Axiom which they cunningly invented, *No Bishop no King*, as to the Scotch Bishops ought to be, *No Arbitrary King*) is known to every Body: that is any wise seen in affairs of that Kingdom. And further it can be proved beyond all contradiction that all the Persecutions and Oppressions that were perpetrated in that Kingdom, are owing not so much to *Lauderdale* or any Minister of State there (some of whom acted only that they might not be turned out, tho' that will never Justifie them) as to those Spiritual Gentlemen.

If the Presbyterians asserted their Government to be P. 6.
Jus Divino, tis no more than what not a few Episcopals do; and tho in true speaking both may be in the wrong, yet if Churches be to be regulated as they were in the Apostolical Age, tho' the Presbyterians cannot pretend to a *Jus Divinum*, yet they may lay claim to an *Apostolical President*, which was always reckoned good Justification for any Practice in the Church: For even St. Peter, for whose Authority over the rest the Roman Catholicks so eagerly contend, calls himself a Fellow-Elder, 1. Pet. 5. 1. Τὸς πρεσβυτέρους τὰς ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ἕγω καὶ συμπρεσβύτερος, *The Elders that are among you I exhort who am a Co-elder*, as that word may be rendred. And St Paul whom others pretend to have been the Head Bishop, never calls himself otherwise than a Minister, Apostle, Servant, or Preacher, and subscribes himself every where the salutation of me Paul, &c. And 'tis observable that the same St. Paul, Acts 20. 17. sent for (not the *Diocesane* Bishop or Bishops as some would have it, but) the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus*; and had there Been any *Diocesane*, or *Diocesanes*, then at *Ephesus*, I do not see how St. Paul could have cleared himself from being an ἀλλοτρεπισκοπος, a *Buſie Body in other Mens matters*, as that word is rendred, 1 Pet. 4. 15. when he sent for the Elders without acquainting the Bishop or Bishops: But it is most remarkable that when he is exhorting them how to acquit themselves, v. 28. he says, Προσέχετε ὁὐν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ποιμνίαν ἐν ᾗ ὑμεῖς το πνεῦμα τὸ δόξον ἔχετε Ἐπισκόποι, &c. Where tho' they were Elders he was speaking to, he says, *Take heed therefore to your selves, and to all the Flock in (or over) which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops*, as the same Word is rendred by our Translators, 1 Tim. 3. 1. and Tit. 1. 17. Which had there been any Distinction then in the Church between a Bishop and a Presbyter, tis not to be supposed the Apostle would have said. And St. John takes to himself only the Appellation of Elder, 2 Joh. 1. 3 Joh. 1. Ο πρεσβύτερος τῇ ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ, ὁ πρεσβύτερος Γαῖου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ *The Elder to the Elect Lady, the Elder to the Well-beloved Gaius*: Not St. Andrew, Glasgow, &c. which seems the assuming to themselves an Authority after the Manner of the Kings of the Gentiles, i. e. Princes, and Noblemen contrary to Christs Express Command, Matt. 20. 25, 26. Since it cannot be denied but Titles are
Badges

Badges of Authority, and wherever they are owned or given Authority is thereby indicated. Nor will it much mend the Matter to say that this Honour is conferred upon them by the Prince, since it is obvious to reply that Christs Command seems expressly to prohibit it, who best knew what Mischief those great Titles and Authority would do in the Christian Church.

This Gentleman farther says, *that as they taught*
Ibid. *the People that their Government was Jure Divino,*
so that People might thereby be obliged to defend them
and it under the Pain of Eternal Damnation, even (when Episcopacy was established by Divine Law,) &c. Where the Gentleman is so eager in Exposing that People that he justly exposes himself to the Laughter of any Understanding person, when his saying that they *might* be obliged unto it, does not deny but they might not: Had he said, they were *bound* or *ought* to do it, he had spoke to the purpose, and in that case he could have accused them of nothing but what not a few of his own Party have been guilty of.

And that Conventicles were prohibited *from a*
Ibid. *just fear that the Old Humour would ferment into a*
Rebellion, is only his assertion 'tis apparent enough that those severe Acts were made principally to support the Bishops, and for fear lest they should be turned out again (as nothing but Force, joyned with the Debauchery and Irreligion of the Generality of their Communion who only affected such Church Governors as spared their Vices, ever kept them in that Kingdom.)

And how cunningly soever he insinuates *that the*
Ibid. *Rebellion at Pentland Hills* in 1666 was the effect of their Field Conventicles, yet 'tis certain that there were but few Conventicles before that Insurrection: The true Matter of fact in this point is, that Major Turner and some others were sent *into* the West of *Scotland*, to suppress the Presbyterians there, the Soldiers were quartered upon FREE QUARTERS besides that they Forc'd the PEOPLE

to pay them 6 *d.* a day, that many Families there were totally Impoverisht; so that they were forced to give over their Farms, and have recourse to the Charity of other honest People for their Subsistence. That in some places when that people were not able to entertain the Soldiers, as they had at their first coming, they fell a beating of 'em and abused them; who with the Neighbourhood standing up in their own defence killed some of the Soldiers, whereupon partly through fear of being executed, and partly thro' Bitterness of Spirit, which their grievous Bondage had caused in them (since as Solomon says, Oppression makes a Wise Man Mad) they betook themselves to Arms, and perswaded other People whose Lives had been imbittered by several Years Oppression to do the same.

That the Indulgence after that Insurrection was granted them out of any favour is a Notorious Untruth: It is sufficiently known that it was a Stratagem used on purpose to divide them, in so far as some Ministers were comprehended in it, and others very popular left out: And it is no less certain that this fully answered their design, for as the Gentleman cunningly upbraids them afterwards, those that preached in the Fields *Ibid.* were too rigid Censurers of their Brethren of the Indulgence, as *vice versa* those of the Indulgence were too Uncharitable towards their Brethren that Preacht in the Fields, which gave so great Advantage to their Enemies that in a short time they were both reduced to a very low Pass: Which shews how applicable that of our Saviour was to both of them, *The Children of this World are wiser in their Generation than the Children of Light.*

And tho the Field-Meetings (as he truly says) were declared to be the *Rendezvous of Rebellion*, P. 7. yet 'tis certain the poor People had no other design in going to them, than that they might hear the Word of God, which they thought was more faithfully dispens'd there than in the Publick Churches: And it is no less certain that it had great Effects on not a few who at first went thither only out of Curiosity, so that while they were under their preaching they seem'd to live quite new Lives from what they did
C
formerly;

formerly ; and when those Field-Meetings were suppress'd those poor Wretches made sad Complaints of their returning to their Vomit, when they were again confin'd to the Ministry of the Episcopal Clergy. Nor is this Gentleman Ingenious when he says, the State was necessitated to suppress them for fear of being subverted ; for the true cause was, because during their Preaching in the Fields, all the adjacent Parishes frequented their Meetings : So that the pretended Orthodox Clergy there had scarce all their own Family to hear them, in few places more. It is false that they had any design against the Government, and though some of them went with Arms to those Meetings, yet 'tis certain they offer'd Wrong to no Body, and dispers'd themselves peaceably after the Sermon was over, unless they were disturb'd by Soldiers ; in which case they had all the reason of the World to defend themselves, for if their Minister was taken, he was sure to be execut'd, and any of the rest were to expect no better than Imprisonment, it may be for some years, if not sent Slaves to the *West-Indies*, as not a few were who could not be charg'd with any thing but going to Meetings. These things consider'd no thinking Man will wonder at their taking Arms along with them, especially since the Doctrine of Self-defence is not now lookt upon as so great a Bugbear as it was represent'd to be by Gentlemen that had neither more Religion nor Honesty than they needed in those topping Years of Loyalty, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86.

It is notoriously false, as he asserts, That the
P. 7. Generality of the Presbyterians of *Scotland*, said that the King had forfeited his Crown for Breaking the Covenant, tho some did. Yet he having taken the Covenant as his Coronation Oath, and Sworn to maintain that Government, and it being on a suppos'd belief of his Sincerity therein that they tender'd him the Crown, 'tis not so extremely to be aggravated if some People said so : Let us but imagine that as the King of *England* takes an Oath to maintain the Church, and should afterwards destroy and overthrow the whole Constitution thereof, and set up another : That none of the Church of *England* would in this case say that he had forfeited the Crown is more than any will now be-

believe: And if so, then this Learned Author has mightily exposed his Weakness, in so basely misrepresenting some Presbyterians for that which some of other Communions would have been guilty of under the same Circumstances.

'Tis as false an Insinuation as ever proceeded from the Father of Lies, *That the Army that was defeated at Bothwell-Bridge, was gathered to defend the Murderers of the Archbishop of St. Andrews.* It is sufficiently known that that rising was occasioned by the late Martyr *Dunee* (as some of our Orthodox Gentlemen reckon him) his going to seize the Ministers and Hearers at a Meeting at *Lowdon-Hill*: That those that were at the Meeting sent out some of their number to entreat him to let them conclude their Work, and they would dismiss themselves speedily and peaceably: That he would give no audience to their Request, whereupon such of them as had Arms (who were not above his Number) drew out to meet him, received his Fire, and afterwards gave this Orthodox *Jura Divino* Champion so warm Entertainment that he was glad to scamper, they pursued them near to *Glasgow*, and the Kings Forces that were there, being fitter to Fight against Naked Men and Women than against such as had Arms, left the Place, so as they had Liberty to enter, and afterwards invited all their Friends to come in to their Assistance. And if any of the Archbishops Murderers were there, that can no more militate against them than King *David's* admitting a great many Persons that were guilty of several Crimes, could against the Lawfulness of his Design. And tho some approved of their Fact, yet 'tis certain a far greater number disapproved it.

The Indemnity, he mentions, which was granted them after *Bothwell-Bridge* was very short lived, *Ibid.* tho no other Provocation was given by them than that our Orthodox Clergy could have few or no Hearers while they were kept up. And our Gentleman *non insanit sine ratione*, while he says that the Parliament finding that those Ministers Preaching up Rebellion; had occasion'd all this danger to King and People (tho 'tis true that there have been Parliaments in *Scotland*, that I believe would not be very unlike to the Orthodox Lady *H.* who hearing a Ministers Text re-

peated, that preached at a Meeting, said, *That the very words of the Text were Treason*) yet all the while nothing of this was proved, tho it was an easie thing in those days to call any thing Rebellion; however there was a specious pretence for the Parliaments so doing, since they going away from those Ministers who preached little else but Loyalty to the Prince; a great part of some of whose Weekly Studies was to enure themselves and train up their People in the Duties of Loyalty, viz. to Drink the Kings Good Health, and Confusion to Whigs and Men of Republican Principles, and to those Preachers who insisted mainly on that which is due to the Sovereign of Heaven and Earth (which amongst all the Honest Heathen had always the good luck to be called Sedition and Rebellion) they might well be jealous lest they should shrink a little in their Loyalty.

Ibid. He next brings the Plot upon the Stage as another Effect of their Field-Preachings. But since the World has now discovered so much Cheat in that part of it which was said to be managed here, which at least was the most considerable, it sufficiently shews how little stress is to be laid on what an *Orthodox* Scotchman (whether of the Clergy or Laity) says, to some of whom it needs not be doubted but a Jesuite may give the Right Hand of Fellowship, for their Excellent Improvements in those Noble Arts of speaking above and besides the Truth, blackning their Adversaries, and a seared Forehead (as well as Conscience) to advance any thing that may but support their Cause.

Ibid. From the foregoing Narrative he draws this Inference, *That it is admired why the Government is taxed with so much Cruelty, and the Acts themselves reproacht as Diabolical*: And to prove the Reasonableness of his Inference, he first gives us to know, that the *Acts against Field Conventicles* are the same with the present Laws of England; and less severe than those made against Dissenters in Queen Elizabeth's time, or those against the Calvinists in Sweden. We might ask this Defender of the Orthodox Cause, if Dissenting Ministers were ordered to be put to Death for preaching in Meetings in Queen Elizabeth's time? But to wave this, we may with good Reason avouch that this Gentleman, how good

good a Lawyer soever he was, is none of the best Casuists; for we are not to take our Measures from what any Protestants or Lutherans do, but from the Word of God, and according to the Dictates of true Christianity, against which if a Parliament makes Acts (such as all those are that tend to Persecution) I do not see how they can be obeyed without Sin : For to apply our Authors own Words, p. 24. " The Parliament " by their Authority *cannot make that fit* which is inconsistent " with Human Nature, &c. And when he or any of his Party can prove that such Laws are consistent with the Word of God, or the Principles of Christianity then, and not till then can he justify Proceedings in that Point.

He pretends that the Liberty of Preaching in Houses was taken away because of their Rebellions. But were all the Presbyterians in Scotland guilty of those Rebellions? Why then ought not those that were Innocent, and lived Peaceably under the Government allowed the Liberty of Worshipping God according to their Consciences? Had this been done, and those only prosecuted that were guilty of those Rebellions, then he might have had something to boast of; but nothing like it was done, but if any Person tho never so Loyal, yet scrupled to join with the present Ministry, no distinction was made betwixt him and the most turbulent: Nay 'tis sufficiently known that Women were not exempted from their Cruelty (persons one would think that could never either by their Policy or Strength undermine the Government, and a Sex that might have expected at least some Protection from the Severity of the Laws, from such a Prince as King Charles the Second was) but were Imprisoned, Fined, and some of them Executed.

His second Reason is, " Whatever might be " said against such Acts in Countreys where Dissen- P. 8:
 " ters never entered into a War, yet in this Isle,
 " where they overturned the Government and Laws, and
 " were upon every Occasion again attempting it, so small a
 " Caution cannot be accounted severe. Where he maliciously
 and falsely lays the War against K. Charles I. both in England
 and Scotland only to the Dissenters Charge, when it is Noto-
 rious that the greatest part of the Parliament Army was at
 first

first made up of the Church of *England*; yea that of them few save the *Landian* Faction joined King *Charles I.* a great part of whose Army (at least the Officers of it) were Roman Catholicks, and 'tis no less certain that the Body of the Parliament of *Scotland*, upon that Kings imposing the Service-Book to be Read in one of the Churches of *Edenborough*, entered into a League to defend themselves from any further Oppression or Tyranny that should be offered. But the Reader may easily perceive by this what credit this Gentleman deserves, whose Prejudice has so far benighted his Understanding as to avouch Lies so easily discoverable; 'tis a plain Indication that he will take a far greater Liberty in things less obvious to Mens Knowledge.

His third Reason is; *That this Caution was much more Just in Scotland than in England, because Dissenters in Scotland were more Bigotted to the Covenant, which is a Constant Fond for Rebellion.* But why the Covenant should be so (tho I am no great stickler for it) I cannot understand, since among other things it binds the Takers thereof, *to preserve and defend the Kings Majesties Person and Authority, in the Preservation of the true Religion* (by which no doubt they mean governing the Church by Presbyters, &c.) And suppose this be an Oath made by the Majority of People, as what is Ratified by Parliament must always be judged to be, why should this be more inclinable to Rebellion than an Oath made to maintain Episcopacy and the Ceremonies? And suppose a King should violate this latter Oath, and endeavour to introduce either Popery or Presbytery, it needs not now be questioned (especially since our Loyal Gentlemen declared that the Reason why those Honest Orthodox *Highlanders* raised their Rebellion was because Presbytery was Establishd in *Scotland*; I might say further, that it was none of the least Reasons of King *James's* Abdication, that he endeavoured to overturn the Church) that he would not meet with much more favour from their Hands than at the most Bigotted Covenanters.

*Hornbeck
sum. Contr.*

I remember I have Read that *Mahomet* in his *Alcoran* where he restricts his Votaries to such a number of Wives, has yet a Reserve for himself: And brings in God speaking thus, *Ar tibi O Prophet a-*
licet

licet quotvis ducere & cum iis concumbere, &c. and so would have his Laws tie up the People, but not himself: I do not see those Gentlemen a whit more reasonable: If Dissenters stand up in their own Defence against Tyranny, it is resisting the Lords Anointed, a Sin that will undoubtedly Damn them; but if they play the same Game, tho without the minutest Provocation or least shew of Reason for it, (as in the Case of the *Highland Rebellion*) 'tis no such matter, they must restore their Church, Rights, &c.

His fourth Reason is, *That the Posterior Acts made against Field Conventicles were the necessary Ibid. Product of new Accessional Degrees of Rebellion.* This is manifestly false, since as above, that at *Pemland Hills* in 1666 was the Effect of the Oppression those poor People groan'd under, and that at *Bothwell-Bridge* was begun in defence of their Ministers Life and Peoples Liberty, and when they had once killed some Soldiers, there was no safety for them to expect but what their Arms could purchase to them.

This Gentleman says afterwards, *That the Governors can say that no Man in Scotland ever suffer'd for his Religion. Ibid.* But what means the Bleating of the Cattel then? Were not Major *Turner* and several others sent to quarter upon those of the West on Free Quarters, besides that they were forced to pay 6*d.* a day, prior to any Rebellion? If this was not Persecution for Religion, the Immortal of *France* (to whom I dare say our Author bore no small respect) has been basely traduced by Republican Spirits. So that were this Gentlemans Paper strictly canvast, it might be justly questioned whether there were more Lies or Sentences in it.

His Malicious Instance of *Renwick* shews the Inveteracy of his Hatred against the Presbyterians; and *Ibid.* he might as well have forbore the mentioning of it: For I have been credibly informed, that *Renwick* was a Romish Priest, and spared on that account, 'tis not unlikely that he might weaken the Presbyterians by keeping up Divisions among them: But that they insisted for his Life, when we have it of a Person who is not wholly abandoned to his Passions, and who will make Conscience of saying nothing but what:

what is Truth, we shall have some reason to give Credit to it.

He next endeavours to render them more odious by shewing how little they had to pretend for the justifying of their Dissent, since there were no Ceremonies enjoyn'd in the Episcopal Church there. But our Gentleman might have forbore the taking upon him the Office of a Casuist, which he seems so ill qualified for: For all the Publick Ministers there since the beginning of the Civil Wars, till King *Charles's* Restauration, had taken the Covenant, which obliged them not to own Diocesan Episcopal Government: And there is no doubt but any Honest Man would think himself bound to disown it, till such time as he were convinced that the Matter of the Oath was unlawful: Now they having, or at least believing they had a dispensation from God to Preach the Word, 'tis not to be supposed they would think themselves discharged from that Office, because they were prohibited to Preach by the Bishop: And 'tis easily supposable their Hearers had no great liking for the Bishops Curates, especially since at the Restauration a very few excepted they were guilty of Breach of Oath, the Matter whereof they could never yet prove to be sinful: And if any Person be reputed Perjur'd, every Honest Man shuns any Commerce with him: Much more if a Man be of so Sacred a Function as is a Preacher of the Word, who that has any thing of Religion in him will so much as Countenance him? Besides, since many of the Laity did take the Covenant, and obliged themselves to disown Episcopal Government, it needed not so much have startled him (if he had any Conscience himself) that those People would not hear the Publick Ministers, till such time as they were satisfied of the unlawfulness of the Oath, since hearing them duely and ordinarily might have seemed to be a down-right Violation of it. Besides, 'tis not improbable that those who are of Opinion that that Office crept into the Church contrary to Christs Institucion, might more scruple at that than at any Ceremony whatsoever. But the Gentleman by what he adds in the end of this Paragraph contradicts himself as if he were in a Frenzy; for if the best of their Ministers and almost all the People Communicated, as
he

he says, Why is he at so hard Labour to shew the Unreasonableness of their Dissent from the Publick Churches?

As to what follows next that the King and Three Estates should be acknowledged the best *Ibid.* Judges of what was *Salus Populi* (an Invidious and Disloyal Word in all their Parties Ears;) it is sufficiently known (as has been hinted above) that we had no Three Estates for a considerable time after the Reformation: But to wave that, we are not always to take the Notion of *Salus Populi* from a Parliament (especially when those Members of it that stood up for the Priviledges of the People were sure to render themselves the Butt of great Persons Fury, which no doubt made Men of Timorous and Pusillanimous Spirits comply with whatever they pleased to impose on them, as it fell out ever since his Royal Highnesses Parliament there, and 'tis not yet forgot that my Lord *Belhaven* for but contradicting them in something they were promoting was sent to Prison, and if I remember right, ordered to be prosecuted, which made Men of Principles to decline any such Trust) But from the Law of God and Nature, as it has been maintained by the best and wisest of all Ages. But 'tis no hard task to demonstrate that most of our Three Estates had little regard either to their own or the *Salus Populi*, when they remitted to the Council a full Power to do whatever they should think convenient for the safety of the Government (as they were pleased to express it, they should have added Arbitrary) who went so far that even they themselves were forced to have recourse to a Pardon, as his Present Majesties Declaration for that Kingdom when he came to rescue that People from those Tyrannous Men, expresses it, part whereof I shall here insert to expose this Gentlemans Impudence in daring to avouch that the Matters of Fact mentioned in his Majesties Declaration were not true, as through his whole Book does notoriously appear.

“ By the Direction of the same Councillors, they have served themselves of an Exorbitant Power, which importeth Slaveries, and requires Oaths of whole Shires, without being founded on any Law, or Act of Parliament: As the Quar-

His Majesties Declaration for Scotland
p. 5.

“ tering of Soldiers at their Discretion, who as they have
 “ sufficient Pay for their Sustainance, so the Kingdom is at
 “ double Charges, without any Reasons given for it; their
 “ committing Gentlemen to Prison, without declaring the
 “ Cause, but on the contrary, forcing them to accuse and
 “ give Evidence against themselves, and imposing Fines ac-
 “ cording to their Pleasure, causing some for fear to desert
 “ their Countreys by Vertue of their Intercommunings,
 “ founded on those evil Pretences: They have so generally
 “ involved every one in this Danger, that the Councillors
 “ themselves could not be secure without having recourse to
 “ a Pardon, or procuring themselves to be excepted, whilst
 “ in the mean while the Common People lay at their Discre-
 “ tion. They gave Power to Officers and Private Soldiers to
 “ commit upon many Subjects who lived in full Peace and
 “ Quietness, the greatest of Barbarities, as to destroy them
 “ by Hanging, Killing, Drowning, without any Form of
 “ Process, and without any Respect had to Age or Sex, not
 “ giving some so much time as to Pray to God, and that with-
 “ out any other reason, save that they would not subscribe
 “ or answer to their Questions which they proposed to them
 “ without any Legal Authority, and against the Common
 “ Right of Men, which leaves to every one a Liberty not to
 “ reveal the Secrets of his Thoughts. Not to mention a
 “ great many other Violences and Oppressions, which this
 “ Distressed Nation has been exposed to, without any assu-
 “ rance of ever seeing an End of them, or being delivered
 “ from them.

The bare mentioning of this is enough to refute his whole
 Vindication, since 'tis obvious that Infinite more credit is due
 to his Majesties Declaration, who undoubtedly would take
 care that he should not be imposed upon in representing the
 Grievances of that Kingdom, which this Gentleman will have
 to be none at all, than to a Person that had a great share in all
 those Oppressions, who, with a great many more, should have
 been made Victims to publick Justice (some of whom seem to
 be too highly favoured) and owe their Lives perhaps to a pre-
 dominancy of Mercy.

He next endeavours to answer Objections, the first whereof is, *That the severe Laws against Conventicles were yet more severely put in Execution by Sir James Turner, &c. which occasion'd the Insurrection at Pentland Hills, &c.* In answer to which the Gentleman stands stiffly by his Arbitrary Tackling, *That all rising in Arms upon any pretence whatsoever is declared Rebellion,* and therefore no body should question but that it was so. But his instance he brings in is very wide of the Mark: For because Men will not grudge Free Quarters to Soldiers when they save them from a Race of Men that (how Orthodox or Loyal soever they may seem to be in his Eyes and the Arbitrary Factions) are really no better than Cormorants, and leave nothing behind them save Marks of their Unhumane Cruelty, I mean the BARBAROUS HIGHLANDERS; Does it therefore follow that if the King sends Soldiers against a part of the Countrey to oppress and impoverish them by all means, and in no wise to defend them from an Enemy, and continue them among them till they have eat up all, and then treat their Persons with all manner of Cruelty; that they must patiently bear all; and that in this Case God and Nature has left them no Power to defend themselves? This were to turn the World upside down, and make God the Author of all the Oppressions that are committed in the World, since he neither will prevent them himself, nor suffer People to do any thing for their own Deliverance, if what he says be true.

As to sending away People to the Plantations, he says, *It is Answered that none were sent away, but such as were taken at Bothwell Bridge, or in Argyle's Rebellion.* Behold the Veracity of an Orthodox Gentleman of the true Church of Scotland! For it is sufficiently known that a considerable Number were sent away in the latter end of the year 78, which was at least half a year before the Rising at Bothwell Bridge, twenty whereof were brought up here to London in order to be Transported thither, as may be proved by Hundreds in this City, but that through the Interest of some Worthy Merchants about the City of London, the Master of the Ship that was to carry them over would not receive them, when he understood that they were sent abroad

for their Nonconformity. In the year 74 or 75, about Thirty of them were sent over into France, and Charitable People in Scotland were necessitated to raise a considerable Sum of Money to redeem them from the Captains that had got the Gift of them: Besides that many were sent into the *West-Indies* towards the latter end of King *Charles's* Reign who could be charged with nothing but refusing to hear the Parish Curate. And when all these things were done this Gentleman was Kings Advocate, and so could neither be Ignorant of the Crime for which, nor of the time when they were sent away: But notwithstanding the Truth of this is so notorious to any in that Kingdom, he had the Impudence to impose those Lies to delude People here, being sufficiently convinced of the truth of the Jesuitical Maxim, *Fortiter calumniare aliquid adhaerebit.*

How much soever Torture may be allowed by *Ibid.* the Law of our Nation, yet this much is certain, that it never was so much put in practice in Scotland for many Hundred years, as it was during the Mild Government of King *Charles II.*

What he says in Defence of Imprisonments is so weak that it deserves no Answer: For where does the Civil Law allow to take Subjects up without any real ground, and on no Proof, and keep them half a year, a year or more in Prison, as several Gentlemen have been served there, not because they dissented from the Establishment Church, but meerly because they opposed them in their designs of Enslaving the Nation?

As to the bringing in the Highlanders on the *West- P. 12.* *Scyth Nations,* and taking Free Quarter there, he says, *It is asserted that many Thousands had gathered in Field Convenicles with Arms for several years, and when these Convenicles which met in several Places pleased to join in one, they could form an Army; to prevent which, the Council, &c.* Where this Author prevaricates after his Old way: For in the first place, let him or any of the Party tell when there was a Rebellion there, but what was either the Effects of unparalleled Oppression; (as there never was greater Oppression any where in Europe than was there) as that at *Penn-land Hills,* or in their own defence, as at *London Hill,* which

was the beginning of that at *Borthwell-Bridge*. And tho some of those that went to those Meetings took Arms along with them, yet 'tis certain they carried Arms upon no other account than to save themselves from being taken by the Soldiers. It is sufficiently known that at first they could not safely Preach in Houses, when they saw that, being resolved if possible to enjoy what they thought the purest Dispensation of the Gospel, they went to unfrequented Heathy Places in the Fields without any Arms: But they had not long gone so to those places but Soldiers were sent out against them, and several of them were taken and imprisoned, to prevent which for the future, those took Arms that had any, with no design to offend any person, but meerly that they might defend themselves from being taken. So that his Accusations in this point might have had some shew of Reason, had they but had a Liberty granted them till such time as they had abused it (which at least King *Charles II.* was obliged to by Treaty at *Breda*) but nothing like this, but all Condemned as Rebellious and Seditious before they discovered any Acts of it, which nothing but their Severity extorted. It is a false Suggestion that no less would satisfy them than abolishing Episcopacy: It is sufficiently known that they would have been very well satisfied with a Liberty, and have lived as Loyally, had it but been granted as the greatest Pretenders thereto, a plain instance whereof we have from their Behaviour from the time that the late King granted an Indulgence, tho they were as far from advancing a Popish Interest, as those who call themselves Orthodox: Who tho they decryed and condemned the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, yet set up a Tyranny if not exceeding it, at least that might comper with it. This Gentleman knows nothing of the Rudeness of those Highlanders, you must know they are his Countrey-men and Orthodox Men, and he had a Talent to lay out only in blackening the Whigs, tho the whole Countrey there ecchoed with the Cries of their Rapines, for they were so far from answering the Councils design of oppressing only Whigs, that they Pillaged and Robb'd whatever they could come at; they made no distinction betwixt Orthodoxism and Whiggism, but all were Phigs to them, so that the Council, was e'en forc'd to send them home again.

gain. I shall only take notice of this on this Subject, that our Orthodox Gentlemen did cast a Copy to the *French King*, to bring down his Heretick by the same Measures as our Orthodox Gentlemen brought down the Whiggish Subjects (unless this Term be *contradictio in adjecto*, as all their Proclamations bore) so far are they from being such Novices as to take Measures from the Order of the Name *Jesus*, that they can prescribe them Methods of destroying and bringing down: And these Measures were effectually followed by the *French King*, till in the end he quite ruined his Huguenot Subjects, as may plainly appear from this, that these Measures were first taken by King *Charles* and his most Loyal Subjects, the Orthodox Church, and is not a little confirmed by a passage that happened between a *Scotch Gentleman* in *France* about the beginning of the Dragooning, and one of that Kings Governours: He finding the Governour to be a Gentleman of a very good Temper, assumed the Boldness to shew him his admiration that the *French King* should take such Barbarous Measures to reduce the *French* Protestants; the other replied, *That it was matter of greater surprize to him that any of the King of Britains Subjects should be so astonish'd at his Masters Measures, since he had taken the same which he used to reduce the Western Shires of Scotland.*

P. 17. How just soever he pretends the Capital Sentences to have been, yet if we consider what simple crazed People they were that were Executed, it is little either to his or that Councils Credit; Persons that might be really called distempered in their Brains, and under deep Melancholy, through the Oppressions they underwent, and the Intercommunings, whereby they were forced to abscond all day, and at Night when others were at rest, seek for that Refreshment which Nature required, whereby they were deprived of all Civil Society: I shall only instance in one of those People, by which you may easily conceive what the rest were: He was so imprudent, that being present at the Execution of one of them, could not forbear railing against the Hangman, calling him, *Murdering Dog*, &c. This Person was thereupon Seized by the Soldiers that were present at the Execution, secured, and a little time after was brought

brought before the Council, where (according to their usual way to ask questions, which if the Persons declined to answer they were reputed Guilty) they asked him, If he had been at *Bainwell-Bridge*, his Answer was, *Aye, that I was*: Another Query was put to him, Had you a Sword about you? He answered, *Aye, and Pistols too*, (whereas a Child might have beat this Champion, and taken all from him.) Hereupon some of the Council who had some consideration of Humane Frailty, said, Send him away, why do we trouble our selves with such a Mad Fellow as this? But others of them that were of our Authors stamp, said, No; But let us put some other Questions to him, and thereupon questioned him about the Kings Authority, and the poor Creature denied all point Blank, and was afterwards Executed for it; and most of them that suffered there were of such distempered Brains as this Creature was; and it was no unusual way with the Council to Execute those distressed People the same day they were brought in to *Edinburgh*, sending them immediately from the Council House to the Place of Execution; which was a certain Indication that some of those Honourable Members, at least those who were highest in Power, acted very differently from what our Religion enjoins us, and had very little of that Spirit of Tendernefs and Charity so much inculcated by it. And if they found that a Person was fully resolved to Die at coming before them, to vex him they would keep him longer: As it fell out to a certain Person in the beginning of King *James's* Reign (before our Gentleman was turned out, for we could see no danger of Popery till such time as Dissenters had Liberty) who appearing before the Council as brisk as his Condition did allow him, expecting as others to be sent straight to the Place of Execution. Some of the Council said, What! You think to die to day, I warrant you; you shall not have that favour, you shall be kept till *Friday*, (it being *Tuesday* or *Wednesday*, I cannot now say positively whether, but heard it for an undoubted Truth) and accordingly he was Executed on *Friday*. And tho some of those People did maintain strange Tenets about Authority, yet I doubt not but their Deaths were precious in Gods sight, and will be required at the hands of those Persons, if a seasonable Repentance

(which

(which it may be no less than a taking severe *Vengeance upon them for their Invasions*, will ever extort from them) do not prevent it. It had been more like a Christian to have sent those People to a Mad-house, to try if there was any possibility of rectifying their Brains, than to a Gibbet. And we know what occasion was taken from the Imprudence of those Poor People by some Spiritual Merchants, to traduce not only all the Presbyterians there, but even all the Dissenters here, and incense the Mob so against them, that it is owing to no less than an Extraordinary restraining Power of God that they were not knocked on the Head as they went along the Streets, so great a Hatred had Men whom no Principles keep back from perpetrating the Wickedest Action, thereby conceived against them.

But I shall briefly expose the Strange, and Unparallel'd Partiality of this Gentleman in vindicating the taking away those poor Peoples Lives, by comparing them with our present *Jacobites*. I think the most Bigotted Reader will grant that this Author has given them as black a Character as is possible to be done, which for the more clear Conviction of his Prevarication I shall say nothing against, only this, *Dato, sed non Concesso* that it were so, it ought to be considered that King Charles II. had promised to maintain that Government by his Coronation Oath, had again promised them a Liberty (if not more) at *Breda*, and notwithstanding, Prior to any Act of Disloyalty on their side, had declared them to be Irreconcilable Enemies, till such times as they altered their Principles (which 'tis not so easie a task for an Ingenious Person to perform as Men that have none do commonly believe) and treated them as such, till at last he made not a few of them to become Haters of his Government. On the other Hand 'tis sufficiently known how the *Jacobites* have acquitted themselves here; their Carriage has been such to Their Present Majesties that it needs not be questioned, but that of all Persons that have been Seditious and Disaffected to a Government for many Ages, they have been and are the most Invererate: For it plainly appears that since Their Majesties Accession to the Crown, they have been consigually Plotting to Subvert the Government, so that the Jesuites themselves may

give

give them the Precedency; and even a Self-preservation seems to have required that some severer Laws had been made against them than as yet have: We may at the same time consider that all this is without the least Provocation given them, since Envy it self cannot with the least shew of Reason traduce Their Majesties Government: Mildness having to a Prodigy discovered it self in all their Actions; the Roman Catholicks themselves might have promised to sit under their own Vines, and eat of their own Fig-trees: And the Church of England was never in a more hopeful way of being firmly established, and again recovering her former Splendor, which had some time been sullied: And notwithstanding this, some of her Members have conceived to irreconcilable a Hatred against this Government, that no less than a Destruction of it would satisfy them. Now if those severe Acts made against those Persons, were to be necessary for the supporting of King Charles II. Government: Then I hope all Persons but themselves will acknowledge that they are no less necessary under this, since 'tis so plain that they have infinitely out-strip the others: And tho they have not had the Courage to appear by themselves in Arms, (which if they had we might been rid of them long ere now,) yet (which is infinitely more dangerous) they have dealt with a Foreign Tyrant to send them Forces, and have taken such Cruel Measures that Humanity it self would abhor. But suppose such severe Acts had been emitted here by the Council, that where-ever a *Jacobite* was taken Plotting, or speaking Treasonable or Seditious Words, he should be forthwith Executed for it, except he would own the Present Government, or take the Oaths to King William and Queen Mary, or say God Bless them, and that without any Verdict brought in by a Jury: Or that if Soldiers should meet with any of those in the Fields, or them that were declared to be such, they should immediately shoot them, I say had these severe Measures been taken against *Jacobites* here (which yet Reasons of Preserving the Government would infinitely more justify than the Proceedings against those simple Creatures in Scotland,) it would have given disgust to not a few Persons; and I am sure this Author would have talkt very loudly against it. In the Name of God then, how can a Man of Learning

suffer Reason to be so far Eclips'd in him, as to vindicate an Action done against those Men, which he would have condemn'd if executed on Persons that are infinitely more dangerous in a Kingdom, Villains in Grain, and Enemies to Mankind it self.

He heaps up several Fallshoods to Justifie the P. 14. 15. granting the Soldiers Power to kill such as disowned the Kings Authority, for that was granted before those two Men were killed at *Swyne-Abby* (which happen'd but towards the end of King *Charles's* Reign) and it cannot to this hour be certainly said who killed them, they might as well have been Episcopal or Roman Catholicks, or it may be some upon a private Pique, &c.

I shall not trouble the Reader any further with taking notice of his fulsome *Itself*, except some particular Proccesses which he mentions.

And the first is that of Mr. *James Mitchill*, which of all Men of the World, one would have thought he should have forbore mentioning, since it is sufficiently known that he had been *Mitchill's* Advocate formerly, and defended him against *Sir John Aldrich*, who was the Kings Advocate before him, and who deserting his Oser in that Cause, that is to say, siding he could not reach him by Law, desisted further Prosecution. For which and other things he was judg'd not a fit Tool for that Place, and so was prefer'd to another, which was not of that consequence, and our Gentleman was thought the fittest Tool, and advanced to it, of whom it may be said that he shed more Blood in the time he held that Place than any Twelve Advocates that were there before, and might (as to that point) have been called another *Jefferies*: He quickly found the means to dispatch him that had formerly been his Client in the same Cause. But notwithstanding all that he says, *Mitchill* was Condemned upon an Extrajudicial Confession, (that is, a Confession not made publicly, *pro Tribunali*, but privately to the then Lord Chancellor, upon promise of his Life, which the Scottish Law allows no Man to be Condemn'd for.) And notwithstanding what our Author says to the contrary, any that knew that Chancellor is firmly perswaded that he would never make such a Promise without

without he had the Councils Order so to do: Besides it was sufficiently known that such a Promise was past, notwithstanding it was afterwards Generally denied, which occasioned a Satyr upon most of the then Members of Council, to expose whom the more, two reputed Atheists (tho no Members of Council) were brought in in the Close, speaking thus.

Come must we Swear by him we don't believe?

Yes, yes, we'll do it, and we'll laugh in our Sleeves.

It's any reason WE should think ought odd,

When THESE point blank Swear, who profess a God?

A Plain Indication that what our Gentleman says was then generally lookt upon as an Untruth, since had there no such promise been made, 'tis not to be supposed the Council would have been so Lampoon'd: And all sorts of Persons, even they that understood the *Scotch* Law as well as the Kings Advocate, said, That tho they believed really that *Mitchell* had been guilty of that Assassination, yet that he was Condemned without such Proof as the Law requires in that point. But he concludes with a Notorious Lie, when he says, *That Mitchell died glorying in his Crimes, and recommending to others the sweetness of such Assassinations.* Since any that was present at the Execution can justify the Falshood of that, and that when he began only to speak of the hardness of the Justice he was served with, as having been Condemned upon an Extrajudicial Confession on promise of Life, the Drums were ordered to Beat, to drown his Voice, after which he applied himself wholly to his Devotion.

His second Instance is that of *Lermonts*, who, as P. 20. he says, was Guilty of a Soldiers Death, in as much as he commanded those who killed him as an Officer: But we may easily see from what is above, that all is not Gospel that proceeds from this Gentlemans Mouth: For it was deposed by several Witnesses, that he was a Mile from the Place when the Soldier was killed, and it was supposed that he was killed by another Soldier firing at some that were at the Meeting. And notwithstanding that three
several

General Bunble (that is, Juries) acquitted him, he was afterwards Condemned by the Council, and Executed accordingly.

To conclude, our Orthodox Gentleman affixes to his Pamphlet Papers emitted by some of that Ignorant Frantick People mentioned above, and Fathers them all upon the Presbyterians of Scotland in general: Such fair dealing is to be expected from Persons of his Kidney. But by our Authors Rule the Villanies perpetrated by the *Jacobites* of the Church of England might be imputed to the Church in general (which all Men of any Consideration would Cry out against.) And it might be as easy to shew that all the *Jacobites* Villanies are the Natural Consequences of Absolute Non-resistance, &c. as it is for him to prove that the Phrenzies of those Ignorant Persons were of the Solemn League and Covenant. Nay there is this odds on the Presbyterians side, that whereas those Principles were espoused by not above two or three of their Clergy, and imbibed by none but the most ignorant and lowest of the Laity: 'Tis too well known that several of great Learning of the Clergy, and Persons of all Ranks of the Laity have been either Advers or Abettors of those Villanies, if not both. It is likewise known, that they restrict the Name of true Churchmen to themselves, as well as the others have that of the only true Presbyterians. So that this Gentleman has laid out his Talents in this Book only to render his Name odious among the Sober part of Mankind. He has left his Successors behind him, who are no less industrious in misrepresenting the Proceedings of the Assembly, and for ought I see they are no readier to asperse than some credulous Persons, of whom the contrary might have been expected, are to give Credit to them. But the World may perhaps have an account how groundless the Calumnies of their selfish Enemies are.

FINIS.